## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

VINCENT F. RIVERA,	
Plaintiff,	CASE NO. 08-12722
v.  JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM, et al.,	PAUL D. BORMAN UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
Defendants.	

## ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY AND HIS MOTION TO PROCEED WITHOUT PREPAYMENT OF THE APPELLATE FEES AND COSTS

Plaintiff Vincent F. Rivera has appealed the Court's dismissal of his *pro se* civil rights complaint. The Court's dismissal was based on 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), which states:

(g) In no event shall a prisoner bring a civil action or appeal a judgment in a civil action or proceeding under this section if the prisoner has, on 3 or more prior occasions, while incarcerated or detained in any facility, brought an action or appeal in a court of the United States that was dismissed on the grounds that it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, unless the prisoner is under imminent danger of serious physical injury.

The Court found that three or more of Plaintiff's prior complaints had been dismissed as frivolous or for failure to state a claim, and because Plaintiff did not prepay the filing fee or show "cause" why his complaint should not be dismissed, the Court dismissed the complaint without prejudice.

Currently before the Court are Plaintiff's application for a certificate of appealability and motion to proceed without prepayment of the appellate filing fee and costs. "[A] certificate of appealability is not necessary for a prisoner civil rights appeal. . . ." *Alexander v. Lucas*, 259

Fed. Appx. 145, 149 n.2 (10th Cir. 2007) (unpublished) (citing Lawson v. Engleman, 67 Fed.

Appx. 524, 527 n.4 (10th Cir. 2003) (unpublished)), cert. denied, \_\_ U.S. \_\_, 128 S. Ct. 1486

(2008). Therefore, Plaintiff's application for a certificate of appealability (Dkt. No. 10) is

DENIED.

The motion to proceed without prepayment of the appellate filing fee and costs (Dkt. No.

12) likewise is **DENIED**. As noted, three or more of Plaintiff's prior complaints have been

dismissed as frivolous or for failure to state a claim, and § 1915(g) bars Plaintiff from bringing

an appeal without prepaying the appellate filing fee. Although an exception to the "three strikes"

rule of § 1915(g) exists for prisoners that are "under imminent danger of serious physical

injury," Plaintiff has not alleged that he is under imminent danger of serious physical injury.

The Court, moreover, determined in its dispositive opinion that Plaintiff's challenge to the

constitutionality of § 1915(g) lacked merit. See Pointer v. Wilkinson, 502 F.3d 369, 377-78 (6th

Cir. 2007); Wilson v. Yaklich, 148 F.3d 596, 604-06 (6th Cir. 1998). Therefore, Plaintiff must

prepay the appellate filing fee.

SO ORDERED.

S/Paul D. Borman

PAUL D. BORMAN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: March 13, 2009

2

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Copies	s of this Order	were served	on the at	torneys of 1	record by	electronic i	means or	U.S.	Mail on
March	13, 2009.								

S/Denise Goodine
Case Manager